Question 1.3: Does our findings reflect the composition of the country as a whole? What do you think could be the cause of this? Answer in 3 to 5 sentences.

I think this could reflect the country as a whole. We see more pollution and other harmful chemicals in the air in urban environments. This makes sense because there are more people, vehicles, stores, etc. Even travelling to big cities like NYC and LA, you can see a haze of smog over the city quite frequently.

Question 2.2: What does your findings suggest about the relationship between the environmental raw data on OZONE, the EJ index for OZONE, and the demographic index used by the EPA? What are potential 'flaws' with this model? Answer in 3 to 5 sentences, at a minimum.

The model for ozone clearly diud not fit the data as well as the PM25 levels. The orange line did not fit well and therefore, there was less correlation.

Question 3.2: Comment on your findings how much of the variation in the EJ Ozone Score is explained by the raw data vs. the demographic index? Why could this be the case? What are potential pitfalls of an EJ Ozone Score like this? Can you think of an example where funding may / or may not be diverted to communities with extreme levels of Ozone in the air? Answer in 3 to 5 sentences, at a minimum.

The variation in the EJ Ozone Score is explained better by the demographic index. This means that the model for demographic index would fit the data more accurately. This could possibly be detrimental because areas where pollution and ozone in the air are worst could be in areas correlated to which demograpihc you are part of. The model might not necessarily show this as more of the variation could be explained by the model.